

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuhl et al. (US 2005/0041613). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every limitation of the claim. *See* MPEP §2131. As to claim 1, Kuhl et al. does not teach each and every limitation of the claim.

Claim 1 recites that the slave device is configurable by the master device to operate in multiple modes wherein each mode is associated with a command length that differs between modes. The Examiner has cited the sniff mode of slave device described in Kuhl et al. Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that the sniff mode actually refers to the number of time slots that a slave device must listen to for data from the master device. Nowhere in the cited section Kuhl et al. discusses the change in command length as recited in claim 1. In fact, the data structure of the transmission between the master and slave device in Kuhl et al. remains the same and conforms to the Bluetooth protocol. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner has stated that “[a] sniff mode in which the slots for master-to-slave data transmission or command length are reduced (page 1, paragraph 0011).” (Emphasis added). Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that time slots and command length refer to two completely different concepts and one skilled in the art will not confuse time slots with command length. In sniff mode, the number of data packets, addressed to a slave device, are reduced according to the allocated time slots. In contrast, claim 1 recites modes that are associated with a command length. Kuhl et al. does not teach this limitation. Accordingly, claim 1 and those depend therefrom are clearly and patentably distinguishable from Kuhl et al.


Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 3-4, 6, and 8-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuhl et al. (US 2005/0041613) in view of Litwin (US 6,704,584).

Claims 8, 13, and 19 have been rejected in the manner of claim 1, which has been distinguished over Kuhl et al. for failing to disclose all claim limitations. Accordingly, claims 8, 13, and 19 and those depend therefrom are patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,


Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137